# ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND THE COURTS

#### **AGENDA**

Wednesday, October 27, 1999 2 PM – Room 415 NW

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Executive Session
  - A. AB 544 (Committee) the lease and operation of correctional facilities and making an appropriation.
- IV. Public Hearing
  - A. AB 558 (Kaufert/Drzewiecki) grants to law enforcement agencies for the purchase of photographic equipment and making an appropriation.
  - **B.** AB 533 (*Joint Legislative Council*) authorizing the appointment of assistant district attorneys to provide restorative justice services; authorizing counties and the department of corrections to contract with religious organizations for the provision of services relating to delinquency and crime prevention and the rehabilitation of offenders; inmate rehabilitation; creating the office of government-sectarian facilitation; establishing a grant program for a neighborhood organization incubator; distributing funding for alcohol and other drug abuse services; and making appropriations.
- V. Announcements
  - A. Next meeting Nov. 4
- VI. Adjournment

# ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND THE COURTS

#### **AGENDA**

Thursday, November 4, 1999 9 AM – Room 415 NW

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Executive Session
  - A. AB 558 (Kaufert/Drzewiecki) grants to law enforcement agencies for the purchase of photographic equipment and making an appropriation.
  - **B. AB 533** (*Joint Legislative Council*) authorizing the appointment of assistant district attorneys to provide restorative justice services; authorizing counties and the department of corrections to contract with religious organizations for the provision of services relating to delinquency and crime prevention and the rehabilitation of offenders; inmate rehabilitation; creating the office of government-sectarian facilitation; establishing a grant program for a neighborhood organization incubator; distributing funding for alcohol and other drug abuse services; and making appropriations.
- IV. Announcements
  - A. Next meeting Nov. 17
- V. Adjournment

	,						1999 Session		
		X	ORIGINAL		UPDATED		LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule No. AB 533/ LRB-3404/4		
	CAL ESTIMATE -2048 N(R10/94)	. 0	CORRECTED		SUPPLEMENTA	-	Amendment No. if Applicable		
deli	norizing the appointment of the department of correction nguency and crime preventi	ion and n; estat	ontract with religi the rehabilitation olishing a grant p	ous of or progra	organizations fo ffenders; inmate am for a neighb	r the provis rehabilitati orhood orga	services; authorizing counties ion of services relating to on; creating the office of anization incubator; distributing		
Fisc	al Effect								
	State: No State Fiscal Effec	_	-Min			·			
	Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum sufficient appropriation.  □ Increase Costs - May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget □ Yes □ No								
	☑ Increase Existing Appropriation	on	☐ Increase Exist	ing Re	venues				
_	<ul><li>☐ Decrease Existing Appropriat</li><li>☐ Create New Appropriation</li></ul>		☐ Decrease Exis	sting R	evenues	☐ Decrease	Costs		
_	Local:   No local government								
1.	<ul><li>☑ Increase Costs</li><li>☑ Permissive</li><li>☑ Manda</li></ul>		B. ☐ Increase Rev		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		of Local Governmental Units Affected:		
2.	☐ Decrease Costs	· 1	I. ☐ Decrease Re		☐ Mandatory s	☐ Towns ☑ Counties	☐ Villages ☐ Cities ☐ Others		
	☐ Permissive ☐ Manda	atory	☐ Permissive	e [	☐ Mandatory	☐ School Dis			
Fund	Sources Affected	-	<b></b>			h. 20 Appropi	iations		
Accu	⊠ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO  mptions Used in Arriving at Fisc		☐ SEG ☐ SEG	<u>-S</u>	s. 20.475(1	)(d)			
This bill adds three assistant district attorney positions and provides appropriate funding to do this. The state will pick up the costs of information technology for the three ADAs.  The local cost is assumed to be equal to the state cost. Local costs will include the costs of space, supplies, other than computers, and support staff. (A survey in 1990 indicated that county prosecution costs approximately equaled state costs.)  Technical note: While the bill adds the needed funds to agency 475 (District Attorneys), the positions are added to agency 505 (Department of Administration). This is a cumbersome arrangement. The only decision is the placement of one of the three new ADA positions. The other two ADA positions are assigned to the Dane and Milwaukee DA offices. All three ADA positions should be placed directly in agency 475, as are all other state ADA positions. Then the placement of the third ADA position could be delayed until the conditions set forth in the beill are met: the Attorney General, in consultation with the department of correction, determines in which DA office to place it.									
		•		•					
	r		•						
Lona-	Range Fiscal Implications		All						
_	bill sunsets the three position	on on Ju	une 30,. 2002	Λ					
Agen	cy/Prepared by: (Name & Phone	No.)	Augh	prized	Signature Teleph	one No.	Date Date		
DA?	Stuart Morse (608) 267-27	00	Me	U ?	7/1/04	M608)2	67-3836 October 25, 1999		

ISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET		· <u></u>	199	9 Session		
Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect DOA-2047 (R10/94)	☑ ORIGINAL ☐ CORRECTED	UPDATED USUPPLEMENTAL	LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule AB533/ LRB-3404/	No. Amendment No.		
ubject uthorizing the appointment of assistant d nd the department of corrections to contrelinquency and crime prevention and the overnment-sectarian facilitation; establish unding for alcohol and other drug abuse s  One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for	rehabilitation of hing a grant prog ervices; and ma	organizations for the offenders; inmate re ram for a neighborh king appropriations.	ne provision of services habilitation; creating the nood organization incub	orizing counties relating to e office of ator; distributing		
One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts fo 4,500 for state purchased computers and r	r State and/or Lo elated informatio	cal Government (do n technology.	not include in annualize	ed fiscal effect):		
l. Annualized Costs:			Annualized Fiscal Impact on State funds from:			
a. State Costs by Category			Increased Costs	Decreased Costs		
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes			\$144,300	<b>\$</b> -		
(FTE Position Changes)			( 3.0 FTE)	(- FTE)		
State Operations - Other Costs			,	-		
Local Assistance				-		
Aids to Individuals or Organizations			•	-		
TOTAL State Costs by Categoria	ory		\$144,300	\$ -		
S. State Costs by Source of Funds  GPR			Increased Costs \$144,300	Decreased Costs		
FED				-		
PRO/PRS				-		
SEG/SEG-S				-		
. State Revenues - Complete this only v state revenues (e.g. etc.)	vhen proposal will in , tax increase, decre	crease or decrease ase in license fee,	Increased Rev.	Decreased Rev.		
GPR Taxes	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
GPR Earned			·	-		
FED				•		
PRO/PRS				-		
SEG/SEG-S				•		
TOTAL State Revenues	·		\$0	\$ -		
	•	FISCAL IMPACT STATE	LOC	AL		
T CHANGE IN COSTS T CHANGE IN REVENUES	\$ <u>144,300</u> \$		\$ <u>144,300</u> \$			
gency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)	<u> </u>	Authorized Signature/T	elephone No.	Date		

FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM					4000 0					
		I PR	<del>4</del> –3404/4		1999 Session					
☑ ORIGINAL	☐ UPDATED		ODUCTIO							
CORRECTED	☐ SUPPLEMEN	CTA:	Rule #	7N# AD 333						
Subject										
Establishes a temporary "Office	e of Government-	Sectarian Facili	tation"							
Fiscal Effect State: □ No State Fiscal Effe	-1									
Check columns below only if bill										
or affects a sum sufficient		priation		Increase Costs - May Within Agency's Budg	be possible to Absorb get □ Yes ☑No					
☐ Increase Existing Appropriat		ase Existing Reven	ues		•					
☐ Decrease Existing Appropria		ease Existing Reve	1	☐ Decrease Costs						
☑ Create New Appropriation										
Local:   No local government costs  Increase Costs  Increase Revenues										
5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:										
2. Decrease Costs	*	emissive — ப ivi ease Revenues	- 1	☐ Towns ☐ Villa ☐ Counties ☐ Othe	•					
☐ Permissive ☐ Mand				☐ School Districts	UWTCS Districts					
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations										
☑ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fis		□ SEG-S	(new) 20.505							
The bill establishes a temporary "Office of Government-Sectarian Facilitation," making an appropriation, and provides 1.0 GPR Project Position. The office and project position expires on November 1, 2002. The purpose of the office is to: 1) assist in the implementation of state and federal laws regarding nondiscrimination against religious organizations; and 2) facilitate interaction between faith-based organizations and state and local government. The office will ensure that religious organizations accepting public funds do not discriminate against any individual; that any religious organization will not attempt to convert people to the religious organization's particular faith; assist faith-based organizations in their efforts to participate in the provision of government services; compile and provide to the public information on government services available through faith-based organizations; and assist faith-based organizations to participate in the provision of government services.  The bill provides \$57,600 GPR for FY00 and \$67,400 GPR in FY01. The bill would need to increase the appropriation to a level consistent with an accurate salary level, or approximately \$17,000 in FY00, and \$28,000 in FY01. The bill also does not provide for any administrative support staff. Given that there needs to be a minimum of \$10,000 budgeted for space, travel, and other office expenses, the amounts in the schedule should be increased to \$67,600 in FY00, and \$77,400 in FY01.  Based on the existing appropriation schedule, the following is a breakout of 20.505 (4)(em):										
Salary \$ 42,700 \$ 50,0										
Fringe \$ 14,900 \$ 17,4										
Sub-Total \$ 57,600 \$ 67,4										
Supplies \$ 10,000 \$ 10,000 Total \$ 67,600 \$ 77,4										
Long-Range Fiscal Implications:										
Drongrad Dv. / Dhone # / Acce										
Ryan Gill 266-6497 Division of Administrative Service Department of Administration		Charles E. McDivision Admir 267-3836	Mar Dan	ne No.	October 26, 1999					

FISCAL ESTIMATE FORM 1999 Session								
		LRB # 3404/	4					
⊠ ORIGINAL	□ UPDATED	INTRODUCTION	ON # AB 533					
☐ CORRECTED	☐ SUPPLEMENTAL	Admin. Rule#						
Subject Neighborhood organization incubator grad	nts and performance	evaluation of AODA progra	ams					
Fiscal Effect				Fri an against				
State: ☐ No State Fiscal Effect								
Check columns below only if bill make		on	☑ Increase Costs - May					
or affects a sum sufficient appro	opriation.		Within Agency's Budg	et □ Yes ⊠ No				
☐ Increase Existing Appropriation	☐ Increase Ex	xisting Revenues						
☐ Decrease Existing Appropriation		Existing Revenues	☐ Decrease Costs					
☑ Create New Appropriation				·				
Local:   No local government cost			1					
□ Increase Costs     □ Permissive □ Mandatory	3. Increase R			ernmental Units Affected:				
2. ☐ Decrease Costs	☐ Permiss 4. ☐ Decrease		☐ Towns ☐ Villag					
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	ì		☐ Counties ☐ Othe ☐ School Districts	ers WTCS Districts				
Fund Sources Affected			th. 20 Appropriations	LI WIOO Districts				
			3)(ft) and (6)(a)					
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal E								
The bill has two provisions that affect the Department.								
Incubator Grant Program  This provision directs the Department to award grants totaling \$100,000 each fiscal year to community-based public or private, nonprofit organizations to conduct the activities listed below. Funding for the Incubator Grant Program is provided in a newly created GPR appropriation.  Provide information to neighborhood organizations about sources of public and private funding. Assist neighborhood organizations in obtaining funding and other assistance from public and private entities. Act as a liaison between the neighborhood organizations and the public and private funding sources. Provide appropriate training and professional development services to members of neighborhood organizations. Engage in outreach efforts to inform neighborhood organizations of the services available from the agency. Undertake other activities to facilitate the effectiveness and development of neighborhood organizations.  To administer the Incubator Grant Program, Department staff would need to develop an application and award process, review completed applications and conduct program monitoring and oversight activities. The grant will be administered through the Department's standard processes and procedures.  Performance Standards for Distribution of AODA Funding This provision directs the Department to promote efficient use of funding for alcohol and drug abuse (AODA) intervention and treatment services by doing all of the following:								
<ul> <li>Developing one or more a develop performance stan</li> </ul>	methods to evaluate idards regarding tho	the effectiveness of AOI see services.	DA intervention and trea	atment services and				
<ul> <li>Adopting policies to ensu intervention and treatmen department performance s</li> </ul>	t services administe	ered is distributed based of	on the effectiveness of th	g for AODA ne services in meeting				
<ul> <li>Requiring every application of the effective</li> </ul>	on for funding for A eness of the services	ODA intervention or tre	atment services to include other drug abuse by rec	de a plan for the ipients of services.				
Long-Range Fiscal Implications:								
Prepared By: / Phone # / Agency N	ame Auti	horized Signature / Teleph	one No.	Date				
DHFS/OSF Andrew Forsaith / 266-	7684 Joh	n Kiesow, 266-9622	<i>4</i> 0W)	10/26/99				

• Requiring every recipient of DHFS funding for AODA services to provide the information necessary for the Department to evaluate the effectiveness of the services provided.

As written, the bill requires performance standards and evaluations for providers of treatment and intervention services funded either with Community Aids funds distributed by the Department to counties or with direct categorical grants awarded by the Department. There are approximately 390 such providers in the state. (There are several hundred additional providers that provide treatment funded through the Medical Assistance program.) Because the Department distributes Community Aids and most direct grants on an annual basis, and the bill requires the Department to conduct the evaluations itself, it is projected that the Department would conduct 390 evaluations per year.

On average, it would take Department staff 160 hours to conduct each evaluation required under the bill. Staff would conduct one or two site visits to evaluate the program's operations, collect program and client data, analyze the resulting data, and write a final report. Based on these assumptions, it is estimated that the bill would generate 62,400 hours of additional workload for DHFS. The Department would require 30.0 FTE program and policy analyst 5 positions plus 3.0 FTE supervisory staff and 3.0 FTE support staff.

The annual cost for salary, fringe, supplies, and rent for these staff would be \$1,768,100. One time costs for computers and office equipment would total \$176,400. While treatment services provided by the evaluated programs are funded with a combination of GPR and federal funding, it is assumed that the cost of the evaluation staff would be charged to GPR. The Department receives sum certain federal grants for treatment services, and therefore it would have to reduce its grants to providers if federal funds were used for evaluations.

#### FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

1999 Session

☑ ORIGINAL ☐ CORRECTED

☐ UPDATED ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL

LRB #-3404/4

INTRODUCTION # AB 533

Admin. Rule #

Subject

Neighborhood organization incubator grants and performance evaluation of AODA programs

1. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):

\$176,400 for computers and office equipment for new positions

II.	\$176,400 for computers and office equipment for new position Annualized Costs:	_	Annualized Fiscal imp	act /	on State fur	de from:
Α.	State Costs by Category State Operations - Salaries and Fringes	\$	Increased Costs	\$	Decrease	
	(FTE Position Changes)		( 36.0 FTE)		(-	FTE)
	State Operations - Other Costs		151,900			
	Local Assistance				-	
	Aids to Individuals or Organizations		100,000		-	
	TOTAL State Costs by Category	\$	1,868,100	\$	-	
B.	State Costs by Source of Funds		Increased Costs		Decrease	d Costs
	GPR	\$	1,868,100	\$	-	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	FED				-	
	PRO/PRS				-	
	SEG/SEG-S					
	State Revenues Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)  GPR Taxes	\$	Increased Rev.	\$	Decrease -	ed Rev.
	GPR Earned					
	FED				No.	
	PRO/PRS				-	
	SEG/SEG-S				_	
	TOTAL State Revenues	\$		\$	-	-

NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPAC	NET A	NNUALIZED	<b>FISCAL</b>	IMPA	CT
-----------------------------	-------	-----------	---------------	------	----

STATE

LOCAL

**NET CHANGE IN COSTS** 

\$\_\_\_\_\$1,868,100\_\_

\*

**NET CHANGE IN REVENUES** 

\$

Date

Prepared By: / Phone # / Agency Name Andrew Forsaith / 266-7684 / DHFS/OSF Authorized Signature/Telephone N John Kiesow, 266-9622

10/26/99

1999	Session	
FISCAL ESTIMATE	CCGGIOII	LRB Number LRB-3404/4
DOA-2048 N(R06/99) X ORIGINA	L UPDATED	Bill Number
☐ CORREC		AB 533
Subject		American state of the state of
Faith-based approaches to crime preventi of AODA programs.	on and justice; performance	evaluation
or Nobripiograms.	•	Administrative Rule Number
Figure 1986 at		
Fiscal Effect   State: ☐ No State Fiscal Effect		
Check columns below only if bill makes a direct ap	vronriation	V Ingragas Costs Marcha was the Alexander
or affects a sum sufficient appropriation.	nophation	X Increase Costs - May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Yes X No
1	rease Existing Revenues	Trialin Agonoy's Dudget   1es   X No
	crease Existing Revenues	
☐ Create New Appropriation		☐ Decrease Costs
Local Plants		<u> </u>
Local: No local government costs	D	1
	crease Revenues Permissive	5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:
·	Permissive	☐ Towns ☐ Villages ☐ Cities  X Counties ☐ Others ☐
	Permissive	☐ School Districts ☐ WTCS Districts
Fund Sources Affected		Chapter 20 Appropriations
X GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ S	EG SEG-S 20.	410(1)(a)
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimates		
This bill contains several topics, that would imp	aget the Department of Corre	ections(DOC):
This bill contains several topics, that would imp	act the Department of Corre	ections(DOC).
Nondiscrimination against religious organization	ns	
This bill authorizes DOC and counties to contra		ns for the provision of services related to
the prevention of delinquency and crime and the	e rehabilitation of offenders	on the same basis as any other
nongovernmental provider. The bill specifies t		
organization or institution from which the indivi		
non faith-based treatment program that will pro an individual requests a different provider. It is	not possible to determine by	Additional costs may be incurred by DOC if
providers, or what additional costs would be in-	not possible to determine in	ow many individuals may request different representations.
providers, or write additional socie would be in	direa il maiapie providera a	e needed for similar services.
Inmate rehabilitation		
This bill authorizes DOC to permit one or more		
rehabilitation program in the Milwaukee AODA		
of the facility for operation of the program. The		
the Milwaukee AODA treatment unit is still und		
community-based organization operating within	the facility would have on o	perating costs.
This bill requires DOC to evaluate, or contract	with a private or public agend	cy for an evaluation of the effectiveness of
the program in reducing recidivism and alcoho		
information necessary to evaluate the program		
appropriate standing committees of the legislate	ure.	_
Long-Range Fiscal Implications		
Prepared by:	Telephone No.	Agency
Elaine Velez	267-7193	Corrections
Dawn Woeshnick	266-0569	
Authorized Signature: , ,		
	Telephone No.	Date
Robert Margolies	Telephone No. 266-2931	10/27/99

#### **Evaluation of AODA Programs**

In addition to the evaluation of the Milwaukee AODA treatment facility, this bill requires DOC to evaluate all of its AODA programs. The Department has a total of 190 AODA programs. Sixty of these programs are support programs (AA, NA, etc.) run by volunteers. FY 98-99 expenditures for the remaining 130 programs totaled \$20,481,000.

DOC will conduct a process evaluation (audit) and determine the effectiveness of the each AODA program by using performance measures. Data collected could include re-arrest, re-conviction, re-admission back to the correctional system, drug/urine screens, etc.

If all 130 programs are evaluated, annualized costs would be \$2,995,200 and 60.00 FTE (1.00 IS Project Leader Specialist, 5.00 Program Planning Analyst 7 Supervisor, 52.00 Program Planning Analyst 4, 1.00 Research Technician 1, 1.00 Program Assistant 2).

Another alternative would be for DOC to evaluate a statistical sample (30%) of its AODA programs,. Annualized costs for this alternative would be \$837,200 and 17.00 FTE (1.00 IS Project Leader Specialist, 1.00 Program Planning Analyst 7 Supervisor, 13.00 Program Planning Analyst 4, 1.00 Research Technician 1, 1.00 Program Assistant 2).

Under either scenario, one-time costs of \$63,100 would be required to purchase a server, maintain/administer website, project design and planning, project development (coding program) and testing and implementation. Also included are 2 licenses.

#### FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET 1999 Session **Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect** LRB Number Amendment No. if Applicable DOA-2047 (R06/99) LRB-3404/4 X ORIGINAL ☐ UPDATED Bill Number Administrative Rule Number **AB 533** CORRECTED SUPPLEMENTAL Subject Faith-based approaches to crime prevention and justice; performance evaluation of AODA programs. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect): \$540,600 II. **Annualized Costs:** Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from: **Increased Costs Decreased Costs State Costs by Category** State Operations - Salaries and Fringes 2,556,800 (FTE Position Changes) (60.00 FTE) FTE) State Operations - Other Costs 438,400 **Local Assistance** Aids to Individuals or Organizations **TOTAL State Costs by Category** \$ 2,995,200 \$ State Costs by Source of Funds **Increased Costs Decreased Costs GPR** 2,995,200 FED PRO/PRS SEG/SEG-S **State Revenues** Complete this only when proposal will increase or Increased Rev. Decreased Rev. decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.) \$ \$ **GPR Taxes GPR Earned FED** PRO/PRS SEG/SEG-S **TOTAL State Revenues** \$ **NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT** STATE LOCAL **NET CHANGE IN COSTS** 2,995,200 **NET CHANGE IN REVENUES** Prepared by: Telephone No. Agency **Elaine Velez** 267-7193 Corrections **Authorized Signature:** Telephone No. Date Relate maybe **Robert Margolies**

266-2931

10/27/99

FIS	C/	L ESTIMATE FORM	·		<del></del>			1999 Session
					LRB#	-3404/	4	1999 Session
	Ø	ORIGINAL	☐ UPDATED			DUCTI		
		CORRECTED	□ SUPPLEMENT	AL	Admin.			
Sub				. ,.				
Га	LI 1-1	based approaches to crime p	revention and	Justic	e; pertorm	ance evalu	lation of AODA progra	ims.
Fisc		Effect						
		tate: 🗹 No State Fiscal Effect heck columns below only if bill mak	ee a direct conren	riation		•	ter	
		or affects a sum sufficient appr		Hauoi			☐ Increase Costs - May Within Agency's Budg	
	Е	Increase Existing Appropriation	☐ Increas	e Exis	sting Revenue	es		·
		Decrease Existing Appropriation	☐ Decrea	se Ex	isting Revenu	es	☐ Decrease Costs	
		Create New Appropriation Cal: KI No local government cost	· e					
1.		Increase Costs	3. ☐ Increa	se Re	venues		5. Types of Local Gove	ernmental Units Affected:
		☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	1			ndatory	☐ Towns ☐ Villa	
2.		Decrease Costs  ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	4. ☐ Decre			ndatory	☐ Counties ☐ Othe	
Fun	d S	ources Affected	, urei	1111551	ve Livia		☐ School Districts  Ch. 20 Appropriations	☐ WTCS Districts
			□PRS □ SEG		SEG-S			
		ptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal In It is provision relating directly		ont c	of Justice of	r the Atter	new Consered in the same	
the	Att	orney General, in consultation	on with the Dep	artm	ent of Corre	ections, to	choose the third coun	vision calling upon
Ass	ist	ant District Attorney position.	The ADAs wil	l be i	mplementir	ng the pilot	projects for the resto	rative justice portion
of t	ne i	legislation. We do not anticip	oate any increa	sed (	costs to imp	plement th	is portion of the legisla	ation.
Add	litic	onally, we do not anticipate th	at this legislation	on w	ill cause ind	creased liti	gation	
				• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			944011.	
			•					
,	٠							
					•		•	
					•			
	. 1							
							•	·
÷								
								,
			·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		4 ,
Lon	g-R	ange Fiscal Implications:						, •
		•						
								<b>T</b>
Pre	par	ed By: / Phone # / Agency l a Richard/267-1932/DOJ	Name	Auth	orized Signa	ture / Teleph	hone No.	Date
JOF	M IFT	a Nichalu/201-1932/DUJ		Di	ana.	W. Hu	chard 267-1937	November 2, 1999

#### Assembly Committee on Corrections and the Courts

ate:		Consent	Seconded by: Clearinghouse Rule: Appointment: Other:		
/S Amdt: /S Amdt: /S Sub Amdt: /S Amdt: /S Amdt: e recommende	0930/1	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amdt to A/S Amdt:		to A/S Sub An	ndt:
Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection			Indefinite Posts Tabling Concurrence Nonconcurren Confirmation		
Rep. Scott Rep. Robe Rep. Scott Rep. Carol Rep. Tim Ho Rep. Euger Rep. Mark Rep. Larry	Owens oven ne Hahn Gundrum Balow encer Coggs Pocan Staskunas		Aye No	Absent	Not Voting
		Totals:			

Motion Carried Motion Failed

Date: 11/4/99  Moved by: Gundrum  AB: 533  AB: SB:		Seconded Clearingho	ouse Rule:	Hoven	
AJR: SJR: A: SR:		Other:	<u>-</u>		
A/S Amdt: 6930/1  A/S Amdt: 6930/1  A/S Sub Amdt: 6930/1  A/S Amdt: 6930/1	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amd	 dt: <u></u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
A/S Amdt:  Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection	to A/S Amdt:	Tabli	finite Postpon ng currence concurrence firmation	to A/S Sub An ement	
Committee Member Rep. Scott Walker, Chair Rep. Robert Goetsch Rep. Scott Suder Rep. Carol Owens Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Hahn Rep. Mark Gundrum Rep. Larry Balow Rep. G. Spencer Coggs Rep. Mark Pocan Rep. Tony Staskunas Rep. David Travis				Absent	Not Voting
	Totals:	10	_0_		·

Motion Carrie
---------------

## Assembly Committee on Corrections and the Courts

Date:       1/4/99         Moved by:       4 man; mous corrections         AB:       533         AB:       SB:         AJR:       SJR:         A:       SR:	sent	Seconded Clearingho Appointme Other:	ouse Rule:		
A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Sub Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amd to A/S Sub Amd to A/S Amdt:	Indefi	inite Postpone ng currence concurrence rmation	to A/S Sub An	ndt:
Committee Member Rep. Scott Walker, Chair Rep. Robert Goetsch Rep. Scott Suder Rep. Carol Owens Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Hahn Rep. Mark Gundrum Rep. Larry Balow Rep. G. Spencer Coggs Rep. Mark Pocan Rep. Tony Staskunas Rep. David Travis		Aye		Absent	Not Voting
	Totals:				

Motion Carried

Motion Failed

Date:		Seconded by: Clearinghouse Rule: Appointment:	Suder
AJR: SJR: SR:		Other:	
A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Sub Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt:	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amd to A/S Amdt:	t:	to A/S Sub Amat:
Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection		Indefinite Postp Tabling Concurrence Nonconcurrence Confirmation	onement
Committee Member Rep. Scott Walker, Chair Rep. Robert Goetsch Rep. Scott Suder Rep. Carol Owens Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Hahn Rep. Mark Gundrum Rep. Larry Balow Rep. G. Spencer Coggs Rep. Mark Pocan Rep. Tony Staskunas Rep. David Travis		Aye  NO  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D  D	Absent Not Voting
	Totals:	<i>N</i>	

$\checkmark$	Motion Carried
--------------	----------------

	in; mous c	onsent	Seconded	by:		
NB: <u>533</u>			Clearingho			
\B: \JR:	SB: SJR:		Appointme Other:	ent:		
\:	SR:		Onier.			
	9921/1					
\/S Amdt:		to A/S Amdt:			<del></del>	
\/S Sub Amdt: \/S Amdt:		— to A/S Sub Amd	+•			
\/S Amdt:		to A/S Amdt:	··		 to A/S Sub An	ndt:
Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction  Adoption  Rejection			Tablin Cond	nite Postpone ng eurrence oncurrence rmation	ment	
Committee Me Rep. Scott Walk Rep. Robert Go Rep. Scott Sude Rep. Carol Owe Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Ho Rep. Mark Gun Rep. Larry Balov Rep. G. Spence Rep. Mark Poco Rep. Tony Stask Rep. David Tray	cer, Chair betsch ens ahn drum w er Coggs an		Aye		Absent	Not Voting
•				<del></del>		

Motion Carried	Motion Failed

Date:       11/4/99         Moved by:       6 eets U         AB:       533         AB:       SB:         AJR:       SJR:         A:       SR:		Seconded by Clearinghou Appointment Other:	use Rule:	Gundrum	
A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Sub Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  A/S Amdt:  Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction  Adoption Rejection	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amd _ to A/S Amdt:	Indefir Tabling Concu	nite Postpone g urrence oncurrence mation	to A/S Sub An ement	ndt:
Committee Member Rep. Scott Walker, Chair Rep. Robert Goetsch Rep. Scott Suder Rep. Carol Owens Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Hahn Rep. Mark Gundrum Rep. Larry Balow Rep. G. Spencer Coggs Rep. Mark Pocan Rep. Tony Staskunas Rep. David Travis				Absent	Not Voting
	Totals:	<u></u>			

Date: Moved by: AB: AB: AJR: A:	N/4/99   SB:   SJR:   SR:	insel	Seconded Clearingh Appointm Other:	ouse Rule:		
A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Sub Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt:	0891/1	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amd to A/S Amdt:	t:		to A/S Sub An	ndt:
Be recommend Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection			Tabli Con None	finite Postpone ing currence concurrence firmation	ement	
Rep. Scott Rep. Robe Rep. Scott Rep. Caro Rep. Tim H Rep. Euge Rep. Mark Rep. Larry	ol Owens loven ene Hahn Gundrum Balow bencer Coggs Pocan Staskunas		Aye		Absent	Not Voting
		Totals:				

V	Motion	Carried
---	--------	---------

#### Assembly Committee on Corrections and the Courts

Date:       I/I/194         Moved by:       Goetzth         AB:       SB:         AJR:       SJR:         A:       SR:		Seconded by: Clearinghouse Rule: Appointment: Other:	Suder	
A/S Amdt:	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amd to A/S Amdt:	  t:	to A/S Sub Am	dt:
Be recommended for:  Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection		Indefinite Postp Tabling Concurrence Nonconcurrence Confirmation		
Committee Member Rep. Scott Walker, Chair Rep. Robert Goetsch Rep. Scott Suder Rep. Carol Owens Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Hahn Rep. Mark Gundrum Rep. Larry Balow Rep. G. Spencer Coggs Rep. Mark Pocan Rep. Tony Staskunas Rep. David Travis		Aye NO DO	Absent	Not Voting
	Totals:	1\		·

Motion Carried Motion Failed

Date: 11/4/99  Moved by: Gotsun  AB: SB: SB: AJR: SJR: A: SR: SR:	SB: SJR:		ed by: house Rule: _ ment: _	Suder	
A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Sub Amdt: A/S Amdt: A/S Amdt:  Be recommended for: Passage Introduction Adoption Rejection	to A/S Amdt: to A/S Sub Amc to A/S Amdt: to A/S Amdt:	Ind Ind Col	efinite Postpone ling ncurrence nconcurrence nfirmation	to A/S Sub Anement	ndt:
Committee Member Rep. Scott Walker, Chair Rep. Robert Goetsch Rep. Scott Suder Rep. Carol Owens Rep. Tim Hoven Rep. Eugene Hahn Rep. Mark Gundrum Rep. Larry Balow Rep. G. Spencer Coggs Rep. Mark Pocan Rep. Tony Staskunas Rep. David Travis	Takala			Absent	Not Voting
	Totals:	8	_3_		



## State of Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services

Tommy G. Thompson, Governor Joe Leean, Secretary

#### Assembly Amendment AB 533

Amend s. 46.03(44)(b): Adopting policies to ensure that, to the extent possible under state and federal law, all funding for alcohol and other drug abuse intervention and treatment services administered by the department is distributed based on gives primary consideration to the effectiveness of the services in meeting department performance standards for alcohol and other drug abuse services.

Note: We are concerned that sub (b) as currently written forces DHFS to consider only information on project effectiveness in making funding decisions. But to make decisions that are in the best interest of the public, the Department should consider a number of factors such as the cost of the project relative to other similar projects and the agency's history in following state and federal laws and guidelines and best practice standards. The effectiveness of the agency's services should certainly be a major consideration, but it should not be the only consideration. And, in some areas of the state, there may only be one provider. If that provider has not demonstrated effectiveness meeting a minimum standard in the past, we would be prevented from funding the provider and working with them to improve their services. The result would be that people would not receive any services. We also need to acknowledge that our ability to predict how effective an agency will be in the future is not perfect.

Amend s. 46.03(44)(d) to say: Requiring every recipient of funding for alcohol and other drug abuse intervention and treatment services to provide the granting agency the results of the evaluation conducted under sub. (c) as information requested by the department for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

Note: We are concerned that sub (d) as currently drafted in the bill would make DHFS directly responsible for evaluating each individual project. This places an incredible fiscal burden and resource drain on the Department. It also is inconsistent with item (c) that requires each agency to include a plan for the evaluation in its application for funding. Requiring local agencies to evaluate their own projects is a better approach because the evaluation can be tailored to the local project needs and be useful in improving project operations in the future. DHFS will be responsible for approving agency evaluation plans and for reviewing and judging evaluation findings and then using these findings in making future funding decisions.



Office of Government Relations

5 Odana Court Madison, WI 53719 608/277-2970 Ext. 123 FAX 608/277-0448

#### **Committee Clerk**

# TESTIMONY OF ROBERT DUEA, PRESIDENT AND C.E.O., LUTHERAN SOCIAL SERVICES OF WISCONSIN AND UPPER MICHIGAN, INC., IN FAVOR OF ASSEMBLY BILL 533

Before the Assembly Committee on Corrections and the Courts

October 27, 1999

Good afternoon. My name is Robert Duea, and I am the president and CEO of Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan. I would like to thank Chairman Scott Walker and Speaker Jensen for this opportunity to testify in favor of Assembly Bill 533.

I represent the largest private, non-profit provider of social services in the state of Wisconsin. We are also the largest *faith-based* provider of social services in the state.

LSS has been active in both adult and juvenile corrections for a very long time. It is an area of ever increasing activity for us. In 1998 we provided services to nearly 3,000 offenders, up 9% from 1997. We provide a range of community-based and residential services for people coming out of the prison system and for people on probation.

We also provide a host of programs throughout the state that focus on diverting at-risk youth from crime to productive lives, often through the use of inhome intervention and mentoring services. Our partnership with 10 counties in the Family Partnership Initiative is a model and forerunner of what can be done.

Although we are a faith-based organization, we are a provider of *human* services, not religious services. This is an important distinction. We do what we do because of our faith, but we do not proselytize. Our mission statement is, "Motivated by the compassion of Christ, we help people improve the quality of their lives."

None of our programming has an explicitly religious component. However, we do have a passion for trying, within the context of our professions, to emulate the prophetic ethic of ministering to the needs of the sick, the powerless and the dispossessed. In our residential programs (more than 200) we are careful to provide transportation to religious services for those who desire them.

Regarding Assembly Bill 533, we are most interested in those provisions relating to non-discrimination in contracting with counties and the Department of Corrections. Tax dollars have been used at every level of government for the delivery of all possible types of human service programs by faith-based organizations for a very long time. That's what we do at LSS, and we do it very, very well.

Overall, we have a very healthy and productive relationship with the DOC. I have heard anecdotal reports of sporadic problems between our programs and some regional DOC employees over our mission statement, which we prominently display in all our programs. These problems were more of an annoyance that have been resolved with clear communication about our program intent. This legislation would cure the problem by resolving any lingering confusion.

Of greater concern are occasional problems we have had with programming that has a vaguely spiritual component to it, in particular 12-step AODA programming. Although not religious in any conventional sense of the word, we have had occasional problems with some state and county employees who object to this approach. We do not require a client to participate in a 12-step approach if the client objects and always make an alternative approach available.

In Wittenberg and in Stoughton we operate Homme Program for Youth and Families. This is a Child Caring Institution (CCI) for more than 100 boys and girls. Many of these youth are Type II (Correctional) and many have been adjudicated as sexual offenders. These are kids who have been victimized first and many don't even recognize their aberrant behavior. The success rate in our treatment is quire high. These are kids that society has a hard time loving. But they are still children – some as young as 12. There is still an excellent chance that we can change their lives.

Our community corrections staff are also very supportive of developing the restorative justice model as a means of promoting rehabilitation in all cases and perhaps diverting some less serious cases out of the court system. As our prison population continues to explode, we cannot afford to ignore this possible approach to criminal justice.

It is imperative that we avoid erecting a wall of separation between church and state that is so tall and so impermeable that funding cannot flow from the state to faith-based organizations that operate programs such as Homme. If we erect such an impermeable wall, who then is going to take care of these children? Who is prepared to step into the gap? I don't see anything in this bill that stands the separation of church and state on its head.

I would like to offer one word of caution. We have carefully crafted a partnership between the public sector and private not-for-profits (including faith-based) to meet the needs of our society. These partnerships are the envy of the world. Just recently Speaker Jensen and Secretary Leann spoke to a group of government leaders from a republic in Siberia who have asked LSS to help them

develop a human services system in a new market-based economy. They are amazed at our partnerships and wish to emulate them.

These partnerships have been crafted over the past 30 years so that programs provided by our organization and others stands up to the scrutiny of separation of church and state. If we move into contracting for religious services (in contrast to human services or education) in the public sector we will see a renewal of the "war" over separation of church and state and our partnerships now and in the future could be put into jeopardy. Having said that, we should continue to promote and foster our existing relationship that achieves legitimate governmental goals. It is not a relationship we need to fear.

I believe the bottom line is that faith in a greater good – however you define it – and faith-motivated people can change lives. That is what we do at Lutheran Social Services. We help to rebuild a broken society one life at a time.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today.

Written testimony submitted by John Emberson in reference to public hearing for 1999 Assembly Bill 533 scheduled by Assembly Committee on Corrections and the Courts.

If Assembly Bill #533 was only about applying our social conscience and exercising our humanitarian concerns for our state's growing prison population - it would be a good bill. If AB533 was only concerned about taking fiscal responsibility for the spiraling costs of corrections - it would be a good bill. However, because AB533 accomplishes both these concerns it becomes not only good - it becomes right and is worthy of passage.

As a member of the Special Committee I had the privilege to hear and talk to many people from various areas and organizations within our state and nation that appeared to share the same sense of urgency about becoming socially involved in crime prevention and criminal rehabilitation. This appears to be a growing trend within many states! We studied means by which faith based approaches were being applied to successfully improve neighborhoods, lower recidivism and we examined the positive aspects of restorative justice in the aftermath of crime.

Interestingly, many of the organizations which demonstrated great effectiveness with inmate rehabilitation had religious affiliation! Some of the community volunteers were themselves people who had been rehabilitated and were now going back to help and mentor others to do the same. Documentation was presented of neighborhoods once drenched in drugs and violent crime were turned around because of the presence of people who came caring and showing interest in their lives. These are examples of the apparent social and economic benefits that religious organizations are already providing without the use of government funding. AB533 strongly upholds this aspect of the separation clause of our U.S. and state constitution by allowing the provision for "Inmate rehabilitation and aftercare" to take place without the use of our tax dollars. At the same time it applies the constitutionality of contracting the use of religious and private organizations under the restricted provisions of the "Charitable Choice" law. This is definitely a "win - win" both fiscally and socially.

AB533 establishes a feedback system of program effectiveness. It insures fiscal responsibility by holding costly alcohol and other drug abuse services accountable for their performance and justifying their expense. For a long time taxpayer conversations about the effectiveness of the DOC have centered on concerns of program continuation without regard to value and performance - this addresses their concern.

AB533 is progressive thinking for a progressive state! A major paradigm shift in how we approach effective justice is provided by initiating restorative justice programs that change the focus of crime away from the state and places it more on the victim and the community. This vision of justice stops costly cold isolation that prevents rehabilitation and changes the thinking to "how do we make things right." While incarceration alone might be easier on an inmate - restorative justice deals with the more true human aspects of change through personal accountability of facing the result of ones crime - taking action to repair the harm caused to the victim and community.

Granted, those incarcerated have made mistakes against society and there is a penalty to be paid, but I believe it is imperative that the public sector come to the realization that they have a responsibility to help those who have made mistakes in society. With a recidivism rate that is unacceptable and the spiraling need for prison space that is costing the taxpayers an unconscionable amount - it is now apparent the current trend reveals our past direction has not and will not bring the needed change. AB533 offers practical fiscal solutions and carries a holistic approach that allows our tax dollars to strengthen humanity through humanity - it deserves a quick and confident passage.